

**REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-89 are pending. Claims 17-22, 38-51, and 68-86 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 23, and 53 are amended, and claims 87-89 are added. Claims 1, 23 and 52 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

**Restriction Requirement**

In the response to the restriction Requirement dated June 14, 2004, the Applicants elected claims 1-37 and 52-67 (Group I) for initial examination. In this Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 17-22 are restricted as related to Group II. The Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional application directed to claims 17-22, 38-51, and 68-86 at a later date if so desired.

**Claim Objection/Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-16, 23-37, and 52-67 because of several informalities. In addition, claims 1-16, 23-37, and 52-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The objection and rejection are respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this objection and the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1, 23, and 53 in order to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection, as well as the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 23, 25-29, 32, 36, 52, 54-56, 59, 63, and 65-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (U.S. 6,665,640);

claims 1, 11, 15, 16, 23, 37, 52, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Woods et al. (U.S. 6,510,417); and

claims 2, 8, 9, 12-14, 24, 30-31, 33-35, 53, 57, 58, and 60-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. in view of Thelen et al. (U.S. 6,430,551). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**Amendments to Independent Claims 1, 23, and 52**

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, each of independent claims 1, 23, and 52 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements/method steps directed to a method/system/programmed medium for enabling a speech-based, Internet search for generating alternative web sites, including

a cohort being a cohort probability indicating a number of times a word will occur in a first range, and

a language being a language probability indicating a number of times a word will occur in a second range, the first range being greater than the second range.

Support for a cohort being a cohort probability indicating a number of times a word will occur in a first range, and a language being a language probability indicating a number of times a

word will occur in a second range, the first range being greater than the second range, can be found in the specification, for example, in paragraph [0027].

By contrast, as can be seen in the Abstract of Bennett et al., this document merely discloses “acoustic speech vectors” and “natural language”.

Further, as can be seen in Woods et al. columns 13n and 14, this document merely discloses “existants, associations, and relationships” and a “lexical table”.

Nowhere in either of Bennett et al. and Woods et al. is there any hint of cohort being a cohort probability indicating a number of times a word will occur in a first range, and a language being a language probability indicating a number of times a word will occur in a second range, the first range being greater than the second range, as set forth in claims 1, 23, and 52.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of method steps/elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1, 23, and 52 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Bennett et al. and Woods et al., at least for the reasons explained above.

Therefore, independent claim 1, 23, and 52 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 87-89 are added to set forth additional novel features of the invention. See paragraph [0074] for support.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is now moot.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 103(a) are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott L. Lowe  
Reg. No. 41,458

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

  
SLL/CTT/te